

**Nevada Department of Education
Teachers and Leaders Council
Wednesday, January 21, 2015 - 9:00 AM**

Meeting Locations		
NV Department of Education Board Room 700 E. Fifth Street Carson City, NV 89701	and	NV Department of Education Second Floor, Board Room 9890 S. Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89183
	and	Great Basin College High Tech Center, RM. 123 1290 Burns Road Elko, NV 89801

MINUTES

1. Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance; Roll Call

9:11 a.m. Chair Salazar called the meeting to order. Pledge of Allegiance recited. Roll call completed with attendance as indicated. A quorum was present. All Council members attended meeting at the Las Vegas location. Council members introduced themselves.

Council Members Present

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Barker, Vice Chair
Theresa Crowley, Member
Amy Henderson, Member
Vida Bierria, Member
Dena Durish, Member
Gabe Gonzales, Member
Terri Janison, Member
Kim Metcalf, Member
Jessie Phee, Member (Arrived 9:42 a.m.)
Theo Small, Member
Dottie Smith, Member

Absent Council Member(s)

Dale Norton, Member
Vacant Seats (2)

NDE Staff Present

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Professional
Leslie James, Education Programs Professional
Laurie Hamilton, Administrative Assistant

Legal Counsel

Robert Whitney, Deputy Attorney General

Invited Guest

Lynn Holdheide, Center on Great Teachers and Leaders

Public in Attendance

Teri White, DCSD
Holly Mercer, WCSD Accountability
Todd Butterworth, Legislative Council Bureau
Salwa Zaki, WCSD DPL
Tim McIvor, NV Assoc. School Psychologists
Yvonne Chaves, CCSD

Emma Dickinson, WCSD, Psych Services
J.T. Stark, WCSD Accountability
Kirsten Odegard, Sierra NV College
Cindy Owings, LCSD
Joe Roberts, NV Assoc. School Psychologists
Karen Stanley, SNRPDP

Irma Pumphrey, CCSD
Dana Galvin, Washoe Education Assoc.
Heather Strasser, CCSD
Sha Vickery, CCSD
Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP
Joni Wing, Truenorthlogic
Heather Synold, CCSD
Craig Stevens, CCSD
Andre Long, CCSD
Peter Reynolds, NASP
Thomas (Todd) Andrews, CCSD School Psychologist
Nancy Kuhles, NSHA Coalition Address Personnel Shortages
Bobbie Shanks, NV Rep to National Assoc. School Nurse Coordinators

Kathleen Vokits, CCSD
Dawn Huckaby, WCSD
Andrea-Klafter-Rakita, CCSD
Sue DeFrancesco, RPDP
Sylvia Tegano, RPDP
Verena Bryan, CCSD
Robert Jones, CCSD Library Services
Jose Delfin, Carson City SD
Sara Negrete, NERPDP

2. Public Comment #1 (*Information/Discussion*)

Elko Public Comment

Bobbie Shanks - School Nurse Coordinator, Elko County School District; NV National Association of School Nurses Board of Directors

Ms. Shanks worked closely with the OLP on evaluation development. She stated that a component was missing as it relates to the nursing clinical process and that there is a good position statement from the National Association of School Nursing (NASN) regarding the supervision and evaluation of the school nurse. NASN's position is that the registered professional school nurse should be clinically supervised and evaluated by a registered nurse knowledgeable in the scope and standards for the practice of school nursing. NASN also recommended that an evaluation process include both the administrative and clinical nursing component based on the standards of practice and professional performance for school nursing practice. She stated that it was the clinical piece that is missing from the nurse evaluation. As this is a critical piece and unique to school nursing, Ms. Shanks recommended that school nurses develop their own rubric for evaluations.

Carson City Public Comment

Emma Dickinson – Nationally Certified School Psychologist, Washoe County School District; NV State Delegate to National Association of School Psychologists

Ms. Dickinson and her colleagues researched current legislative initiatives which examine goals of educator contributions to student achievement and evaluate personnel on high value educational practices. National leaders collaborated with like professionals and developed and implemented a comprehensive practice model utilizing best and latest research. They launched the Comprehensive National School Psychologist Practice Model in 2010. This practice model delineated ten (10) areas of training that school psychologists have within their skillsets. These skillsets are unique to the graduate training of school psychologists and is distinct from other educational support professionals. Further, these leaders developed a national set of guidelines for the evaluation of school psychologists. School Psychologists should be evaluated only by others trained in school psychology. It is important for the TLC to realize that this practice model has already been adapted into a nationally recognized rubric used in the Washoe County School District. Ms. Dickinson suggested that perhaps a better focus of TLC energies is in expansion of existing practice to better match the NASP model. Research supports that when this model is fully able to be implemented, it adds to student achievement. She added that her colleagues were willing to collaborate with the Council to adopt their practice model and make the evaluation of school psychologists standardized throughout the state of Nevada. They believe that this approach will lead to quality evaluations for school psychologists, better morale and retention of school psychologists statewide, and greater student achievement throughout all of Nevada.

Nancy Kuhles – Speech Language Pathologist; Co-Chair of the NSHA Coalition to Address Personnel Shortages in Special Education and Related Services

Ms. Kuhles served as a member of the NV Department of Education's Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) Advisory Team and Speech Language Pathology Stakeholder Group since July 2014. They worked to develop an evaluation system that is reflective of the unique roles and responsibilities of each profession. They reflected on practices in relation to national standards and best practices that are highest leverage and researched-based to foster student and/or adult learning and growth, and identifying how it is reflected in the NEPF standards and indicators. She stated that it is her understanding that implementation of NEPF for Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) could begin in fall 2015. She voiced her concern about implementation occurring so soon. She respectfully asked members of the Council to consider waiting another year to allow for a validation study, evaluator training, and an increase in overall awareness and knowledge among stakeholders of the Other Licensed Personnel evaluation system; thus increasing the opportunity for a well done implementation. She believes it is important to determine to what extent the NEPF for OLEP provides a valid, feasible, defensible, and fair system of evaluation; an evaluation system that helps a professional improve their practice.

Las Vegas Public Comment

Tim McIvor - President, NV Association of School Psychology

Mr. McIvor stated that the NV Association of School Psychology represents the vast majority of school psychologists in Nevada. They constantly gain member feedback to ensure that they reflect their membership's voice. His message on behalf of the association is that the school psychologists of Nevada want the National School Psychology Standards to be their evaluation standards. These national standards align with student outcomes and are rigorous. The National Association of School Psychology spent over ten (10) years developing these standards. They are also relevant. They spent five years piloting these standards before their publication in 2012, ensuring that they work for school psychologists in urban, suburban, and rural districts. Mr. McIvor offered that if TLC wants school psychologists to be appraised at the highest standards possible, they will allow school psychologists to continue to implement these National School Psychology Standards. He further stated that they want to make it clear that they agree with the intent of NEPF and that standards need to be raised. Student outcomes must be the goal, which is why they want the National School Psychology Standards in place. National standards have been implemented across the nation. They have recently been implemented in Nevada. After ten (10) years of work, there is finally an answer. Keeping the national standards is a win/win. On the one hand, the work is already done for those involved in making school psychology standards. On the other hand, school psychologists will be appraised by standards with clear logic, rigor, and relevance.

Joe Roberts – Nationally Certified School Psychologist; Member of the National Association of School Psychologists; Public School Psychologist, NV

Mr. Roberts served in other areas as a teacher and school administrator. Working with NV Association of School Psychologists, he helped develop professional standards and practices for school psychologists across the state. Mr. Roberts stated that the NASP practice model is a better alternative. He stated that the role of school psychologists is very different from that of a teacher. School Psychologists provide support to teachers to deliver their instruction; but, they do much more than that. They also support administrators, parents, and students across the school community. To measure psychologists' professional practice in the same manner that you would measure a teacher, would be an inaccurate evaluation of their performance. The Ten (10) Domains of the NASP Practice Model can be utilized to measure school psychologist's support across the entire school community. High academic excellence and aiming higher for all students is a must, and must be the focus for the State of Nevada. Mr. Roberts concluded that all school psychologists must provide positive behavioral support, equity, and access for all learners.

Heather Strasser – School Nurse, Clark County School District

Ms. Strasser, on behalf of NV school nurses, requested their own evaluation tool that addresses the extensive responsibilities and duties they perform. School nurses support the utilization the NEPF instructional standards in the tool; however, the professional responsibilities standards portion does not fully capture the most significant and important measures of professional nursing standards. She stated that the majority of their nursing

competencies fall under the Professional Obligation Standard 3. Yet, the vast magnitude of what they do is not fully reflected in this small portion of the standards. Ms. Strasser stated that the role of the school nurse has evolved significantly over the years. An increasing number of children enter schools with acute and chronic health conditions requiring nursing management throughout the day, including specialized health procedures. School nurses manage the health services program within their schools. They also oversee the nursing care given by others while retaining accountability for the quality of care given. School nurses supervise health aides and unlicensed assistant personnel to include training and documentation of competency, so that care is provided in a safe and effective manner at school. Ms. Strasser stated that the NV State Board of Nursing has issued the School Nurse Regulation and Advisory Opinion regarding the supervision, duties, and requirements for school nurses, as well as the delegation of nursing duties outlined in NRS 391.207 and 391.208. Acknowledging the high stakes in performance evaluations, school nurses requested their own performance evaluation tool that encompasses the wide range of nursing activities. These activities must include the NEPF instructional standards and their own professional standards that reflect the specialization in the nursing care of children to foster optimal outcomes and academic success.

Irma Pumphrey – Health Service Coordinator, Clark County School District

School nurses from Elko, Washoe, Carson, Lyon, and Clark Counties collaborated at meetings fostered by the NV Department of Education (NDE) and also on conference calls outside of NDE meetings. In their meetings, agreement was reached regarding the applicability of the NEPF instructional standards to school nurse practice and the need to retain those in the statewide rubric. The first six standards of the American Nurses Association and the National Association of School Nurses fully align with the NEPF instructional standards. Ms. Pumphrey offered that school nurses were also in agreement that the professional practice standards for school nurses need to reflect the unique nature of health care delivery in the school setting. NRS 632.240 states that nursing services must be supervised by a chief administrative nurse. This is true of all nurses in Nevada. NRS 391.207 further states that school nurses must be supervised by a chief nurse. NRS 391.208 outlines the duties of a school nurse. The Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 632.226 specifies requirements for delegation of nursing care in school settings. The NV State Board of Nursing School Nursing Regulation and Advisory Opinion further dictates the parameters within which school nurses must practice. In compliance with these statutes and administrative code, it is the chief nurse not the school principal, who is charged with the supervision of school nurses and health care delivery. The numerous laws dictating the practice of school nursing illuminate the need to evaluate school nurses differently than other educational disciplines. On behalf of the school nurses that she represents, Ms. Pumphrey asked that school nurses in Nevada be given the opportunity to develop a rubric which meets the currently adopted instructional standards. She also asked that the Professional Practice Standards be written to be truly reflective of the National Association of School Nurses and American Nurses Association Standards. They need for the rubric to be reflective of the many regulatory standards as set forth by NRS, NAC, and the NV State Board of Nursing. It is extremely import that the professional responsibility portion of their rubric carry enough legal weight to ensure public safety. They are asking that school nurses be allowed to develop a statewide rubric which addresses the unique duties of the school nurse. They hope to continue working as professionals across the state in an effort to improve learning outcomes for all students.

3. Approval of Flexible Agenda *(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)*

Member Crowley made a motion to approve a flexible agenda. Member Barker seconded the motion. Member Janison asked that Item #7 be moved for discussion as soon as the invited speaker arrives. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. Approval of November 19, 2014 Meeting Minutes *(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)*

Following time for members to review the minutes, Member Small made a motion to approve. Leslie James noted a revision to bottom of Page 3 regarding a statement and subsequent motion made by Sharla Hales. **Member Crowley called for a motion on the revision and Member Janison seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Member Jessie Phee arrived: 9:42 am

5. Department of Education Updates on NEPF Communication, Policy, Implementation, and Validation Study (Information/Discussion) Dr. Vineyard not in attendance. Dena Durish, Director, NDE Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement provided updates.

A. NDE Communication Update

NDE website has been and continues to be updated to better communicate the work of each Division.

- The NEPF link found under the Office of Educator Development and Support now has the *CRESST* login for the training modules with the user ID and password.
- Validation Study communication updates have been added.
- Revisions completed to the tools/protocols based on feedback from the field.

Director Durish shared that she attended the NASS (Nevada Association of School Superintendents) meeting to share NDE updates. The following items related to the NEPF were discussed.

- Parallel evaluation system for 14-15
- Memorandums of understanding (MOU)
- TLC meeting/status updates
- Validation study timeline/process/next steps

The Superintendents will also be meeting with the WestEd Validation Study Team sometime in March to conduct a focus group discussion. This year's validation study is not just to look at implementation of the evaluation cycle, but to also determine perceptions, readiness, and level of understanding of all educators.

B. Validation Study Update

Director Durish explained the communication efforts being made regarding the validation study, including the website where study updates and information are found. The study includes 143 schools from which principals will choose 10% or 10 of their teachers to participate in the study, whichever is greater. WestEd is receiving information from the schools and provides frequent updates to NDE staff. NDE staff members are working to increase communication between WestEd RPDPs via regularly scheduled phone conferences.

Member Janison expressed concern that principals are not included in the study. Director Durish explained the focus of the study and that WestEd staff said that we would most likely not be able to get a big enough sample size for them to be evaluated. Director Durish reminded the group that principals will be held accountable along with teachers and other licensed personnel when the statewide performance evaluation system is implemented in the 2015-2016 school year.

C. RPDP Training

There was a discussion at the last meeting regarding Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) training. This training with Dr. Heritage was held January 6, 2015. The RPDPs will provide further updates later in agenda.

D. Legislative Update

The Governor's agenda is heavily focused on education and NDE is excited about the inclusion of the need for effective educators, as well as a focus on modernizing the system to meet the needs of various student populations and ensure that all students are college and career ready. Director Durish encouraged everyone to be aware and get involved in the important conversations throughout the session and referenced some of the initiatives mentioned by the Governor in the State of the State: ESL, Special Education, Underperforming Schools, Achievement Schools, Victory Schools, and Zoom Schools.

6. Recommendations for a Process for Peer Evaluations of Teachers, Including Criteria for School Districts to Determine Which Educational Personnel are Qualified to Conduct Peer Reviews

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar reviewed previous discussions and materials regarding the process for peer evaluation of teachers. Recommendations regarding the selection, training, and support for evaluators were also discussed. Members discussed identifying the criteria for districts to follow when developing their peer evaluation systems. (See handout for specific details.)

Chair Salazar stated that she needed three (3) motions; one for each segment, and then a final motion stating that these are the recommendations to be taken before SBE to put in guidelines for districts in order to implement this system.

Selection

Section 1 - Selection Process: The effective system for career evaluation is highly dependent on three (3) factors; the selection process, training, and support. TLC agreed upon five (5) recommendations that must be in place to successfully implement this system. (See handout for details.)

Chair Salazar asked for any discussion or clarification in regard to Section I – Selection Process. Discussion centered about the three (3) years of quality teaching for peer evaluators; concern over novice teachers becoming peer evaluators; the three year standard as the minimum requirement for national board certification; and not over-burdening rural districts with prescriptives and leaving the final decisions to Superintendents.

Motion #1

Chair Salazar asked to entertain a motion to accept the selection process with these recommendations. Member Janison so moved. Member Small seconded the motion.

(From Audio Recording: 1:10:48)

It was brought to the group's attention that audio had been lost between Las Vegas and Carson City. Approximately four (4) minutes of audio was lost.

(South Audio Recording Resumes at 1:14:17 per Audio Monitor)

The wide-ranging discussion continued including other states' and jurisdictions' systems of educator evaluations, evaluation and observation periods, Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR), state funding, and clarification of laws that may conflict with each other to be added to Agenda Item #9.

Chair Salazar asked for any other additional comments or clarifications with regard to the motion on the floor; which was the approval of the selection process recommendations to the State Board of Ed from TLC. Hearing none, she called for the vote. Motion #1 in regards to the selection process was carried unanimously.

Training

Chair Salazar began with the idea that teachers must know that Peer Evaluators have high quality training. Without this assurance, teachers are unlikely to trust the objectivity of Peer Evaluators or the feedback received according to the American Institutes for Research (AIR). TLC recommends certification to ensure accuracy, consistency, fairness, and reliability in conducting observations; and then require calibration on providing feedback. Training should include the following: NEPF protocols and procedures, observation tools, rubrics for a narrative, confidentiality, data security, data collection, conducting observations, avoiding personal biases in scoring, leading discussion and providing quality feedback, curriculum as standards for teachers being observed, and professional instruction strategies for collaboratively discussing instructional practices for teachers. Training should align to administrator training and include training in how to give appropriate feedback and engage teachers in conversation about practice. These must be the requirements for training if districts are going to put this in place as part of their evaluation system.

Chair Salazar called for a motion and then a discussion with regard to this segment.

Member Metcalf - Moved that the recommendation be accepted.

Chair Salazar – Restated that there was a motion on the floor to accept the recommendations on Peer Evaluator Training. She asked for a second.

Member Smith – Seconded.

Chair Salazar – Asked for further discussion.

Discussion ensued among members as to the peer evaluator selection process; pre-qualification; required training; training quality; competencies demonstration; levels of certification; reliability and accuracy in scoring; implementation; monitoring; guidelines; regulations; and standard practices of the peer evaluator program.

Chair Salazar – Asked for any questions or comments on the motion on the floor. Hearing none, she moved to the vote. Motion carried unanimously.

Support

Chair Salazar – Entertained a motion for approval for Peer Evaluator Support and then discussion.

Member Metcalf – Moved to approve the recommendation.

Chair Salazar – Stated that there was a motion on the floor to approve TLC Peer Evaluator Support recommendations. She asked for a second.

Member Crowley – Seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar – Confirmed the seconded motion and asked for discussion.

Member discussion was centered on previously agreed upon ideas that peer observers be regularly monitored; have opportunities for recalibration; that reliability checks and recalibrations are provided several times per year, or annually at a minimum; would peer evaluators would be considered as Other Learning Personnel; where they might fall under the NEPF as acting in administrator in a proxy role, teacher, or a teacher on special assignment; who has oversight of peer evaluators, as they are staff providing evidence in a teacher evaluation; do peer evaluators make final summative decisions for the evaluation; what are teacher rights relating to peer evaluations; district legal responsibilities to teachers regarding peer evaluators; evaluator assignments (one or multiple schools); peer evaluators ties to pay for performance; district determinations as to peer evaluators; and support tools, effectiveness, etc.

Chair Salazar – Stated that there had been substantial discussion, that there was a motion on the floor, and she wanted to move to a vote. Motion carried unanimously. Chair Salazar stated that she will re-write these motions one more time and bring them back for one final vote for approval for each one of three segments. They will be finalized at the meeting on March 25, 2015.

Chair Salazar – Welcomed and thanked guest presenter Lynn Holdheide for being instrumental in the formation of TLC's recommendations to take forward that meet the needs of Nevada educators.

She then called for a ten (10) minute break due to technical difficulties.

Chair Salazar – Called the meeting to order and announced Agenda Item #7 for review. She introduced Kathleen Galland-Collins and Lynn Holdheide to update the Council with recommendations for Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP).

7. Recommendations for Other Licensed Educational Personnel/Group 3 Framework *(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action)*

A. Update on Stakeholder/Advisory Team Meetings

Lynn Holdheide introduced herself as the Deputy Director of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. She provided a description of the work, scope, and services offered by the GTL Center. Deputy Director Holdheide detailed her work in the field of specialist personnel evaluation with states in addition to Nevada. She directed the group to her PowerPoint presentation. (See handouts for details.)

Chair Salazar – Asked for questions from the members after Ms. Holdheide's presentation.

Member's questions included the following topics: someone other than a principal evaluating an OLEP, such as a Chief Nurse for a School Nurse, and how that affects the nurse's evaluation under the NEPF rubric; how does the evaluation then provide benefit to each profession without creating an individual evaluation for each one of the groups; if OLEPs are not at a school site consistently, the evaluator (peer, principal, supervising professional) may not observe much of the job that the OLEP being observed performs; Peer evaluators and principals may be looking for a different set of criteria by which to evaluate, potentially placing the OLEP at a disadvantage.

Lynn Holdheide and Member Phee provided feedback that included the following: it might be important to make OLEP evaluation rubric decisions at a district level rather than at a state level; there are things that are similar in each group that will allow development of a common language and the indicators capture those commonalities; national association standards have been used by some states and can be used to focus on the roles and responsibilities for that job; principals can seek the input of all specialists in the building in regard to rubrics used in OLEP evaluations; and Pennsylvania developed a model in which they created questions for each part of the rubric that they wanted the evaluators to ask the professional.

B. Alignment with NEPF Group 1 and 2 Teacher Standards and Indicators – Instructional and Professional Responsibilities

NDE EPP Galland-Collins – Reviewed the information packet she provided with the group to familiarize them prior to the discussion. The handouts included a PowerPoint presentation, possible rubric samples for different OLEP groups, rubric recommendations from specific OLEP groups, cross-walking with national standards for particular OLEP groups, and specific OLEP group professional responsibilities suggested options. EPP Galland-Collins then reviewed TLC's guidance from the November 19th meeting in regard to maintaining the instructional standards in the NEPF, giving some flexibility in the indicators, and modification versus augmentation and how that affects the validity of the rubric. She proceeded with her PowerPoint presentation. NOTE: The meeting audio recording was lost for approximately six minutes. (See handouts for details.)

Member Discussion – Began and included the following topics: NEPF issues as they would play out during the upcoming legislative session; issues still pending among OLEP groups; lack of consensus among groups; legislative restrictions; definitions of who /what groups are OLEPs; who is responsible to define OLEPs as they are regulated by legislation; and development of NEPF uniformity with current legislation; and inclusion of certain OLP groups in NEPF appropriate.

Chair Salazar – Called for a 30 minute lunch break.

Chair Salazar – Called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

EPP Galland-Collins – Resumed her presentation with Professional Responsibilities. Wide-ranging member discussion continued at various points of the presentation. (See handout for details.)

Chair Salazar – Asked for any other discussion in regard to the work of Kat and the stakeholder groups. She reminded the Council that their charge is to have the NEPF model ready to submit. She recommended that

they prioritize items by going back to the crosswalk and alignment and look for key indicators the could serve for some of the groups that are not going to use Standard #6; as the more representative it is of the standards, the more valuable it will be to those educators. Chair Salazar asked for additional discussion. Hearing none, she called for Agenda Item #8.

C. NEPF Group 3 “Business Rules”

(Business Rules were not specifically discussed as a stand-alone agenda item. NEPF business rules were mentioned, included, and discussed as part of Agenda Item #7B.)

8. Update on National Issues and Legal Landscape of Educator Evaluation (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Provided a comprehensive overview of national policy relating to education. She focused on two major items: the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act, or what ESA Waivers look like to counter it, and education news and trends. During her PowerPoint presentation, there were multiple discussions by members on national educational issues and their effect on state and local agencies. (See handout for details.)

9. 2015 Legislative Session – Items for Consideration (*Information/Discussion/For Possible Action*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Returned to her PowerPoint presentation to set the stage in regard to what is next for TLC and finalizing their recommendations to COPS. Member discussions encompassed student outcomes; recommendations for extension based on renewal process; measures and weights flexibility; sources of data collection and multiple measures; benchmarks in other states; NEPF for principals; administrators; central office staff; and TLC recommendations in regard to inclusion or special considerations for OLEP.

Chair Salazar – Stated that members needed to come to consensus and asked if they wanted to continue with the system as it is or have further discussion as to what it might be. After some discussion, Chair Salazar called for a motion.

Member Metcalf – Moved that there be further discussion about whether 50% is the right percentage and what might constitute that percentage.

Member Janison – Seconded the motion, as she had clarifying questions she would like to ask.

Chair Salazar – Stated that there was a motion on the floor for which she asked for discussion. She reiterated that the main idea of the motion is that TLC might consider some recommendations that would go forward to the legislators with regard to how the student outcomes are currently measured. She added that the current measurement says that 50% student outcomes are as measured by state assessments; Group 1 Teachers 25/25 split; and again the three areas target growth and gap and for non-tested grades and subjects go on aggregate and that is the current statute language. The vote before TLC was that they do not want to maintain what is currently in statute and would like to discuss further some potential recommendations as to how student outcomes might be defined. They would like to state as the TLC, that they believe there needs to be some change to the current law as it stands.

Chair Salazar – Clarified that the motion up for a vote was whether to talk about any potential changes; not what the changes are, if any. She stated that the discussion was now on the table.

Member discussion included whether or not the Interim Education Committee would address the student outcome issue again and it would be taken out of the hands of TLC; that there seems to be interest in TLC’s opinion and the group should come to consensus as to whether or not to pass a

motion that says TLC wants to have a discussion in regard to student outcomes as currently defined in NEPF.

Member Norton – Called for the question.

Chair Salazar – Asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. Motion carried unanimously. Chair restated that TLC has agreed to engage in further discussion on the topic of percentage of student outcomes in NEPF. To that end, it was suggested that another TLC meeting be added in February 2015, to solely discuss these issues that will not be able to be completed during the current meeting.

Members had multiple responses and discussions in regard to a possible additional meeting. A determination was made to hold a previously unscheduled TLC meeting on February 18, 2015. It was agreed that the meeting agenda would be limited to TLC legislative recommendations and will be held only in the morning. Under the agreed conditions a quorum will be present. NDE staff will make arrangements for locations, video conferencing, and audio recordings between Carson City, Las Vegas, and Elko as possible.

Member Metcalf – Wanted the minutes to reflect that the meeting was much more efficient and effective with everyone in the same room. General agreement was voiced by members.

Members Crowley, Henderson, Barker, departed meeting for their return to northern Nevada at 4:01 pm.

- 10. Update on Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by the Teacher and Leaders Council of Nevada and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 391.544** (*Information/Discussion/For Possible Action*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair; Dr. Sarah Negrete, Northeastern RPDP Director; Kirsten Gleissner, Northwestern RPDP Director; Bill Hanlon, Southern RPDP Director

Sarah Negrete – Provided a review of WestEd’s RPDP Northeast Region activities. The topics covered included: training delivered to their validation school administrators; two sessions directed to the evaluation cycle that administrators must follow as validation school principals; completion of another round of administrator validation trainings around the Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) Training received from WestEd; progress toward fulfilling the requirements of the self-assessment and their SMART goals beginning; two days of training offered to teachers whether part of validation study or not; substitute money or stipends to teachers attending training on evenings or Saturdays; Humboldt, White Pine, Elko, Lander, Eureka, Pershing district updates; there has been 100% attendance thus far for the validation school administrator training.

Karen Stanley – Represented Bill Hanlon, Southern RPDP Director and presented overview for the region, including the following subjects: training validation study site administrators; optional trainings to prep for Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) Trainings; training updates for evaluators of principals in Clark, Nye, Mineral, Esmerelda, and Lincoln districts; met with CCSD as to implementation of NEPF; training content providers as to Inter-Rater Reliability; bi-weekly phone conference with Dena Durish of NDE to discuss future actions.

- 11. Meeting Summary and Future Meeting Agenda Items** (*Information/Discussion/for Possible Action*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Stated that it was agreed that the items not finished today will be discussed during the established meeting of February 18, 2015. For the scheduled March meeting there will be some additional information and recommendations from the OLEP Group 3 Task Force and the Peer Evaluator discussion will be continued.

- 12. Additional Council Member Comments** (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Asked if there were any additional comments from TLC members.

Member Durish – Mentioned that a UNLV graduate assistant had been approved to assist Kat with OLEP research, compilation of data and distribution through the end of June.

13. Public Comment #2 (*Information/Discussion*) Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair will impose a time limit of three minutes, non-transferrable for each speaker. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the TLC's jurisdiction, control, or advisory power.

Pete Reynolds –Administrator for Psychological Services, Clark County School District.

Mr. Reynolds began that he also worked with the stakeholders. They knew this meeting was significant. To put so much consideration into the OLEP group speaks to the fact that TLC is grappling with this. He said that he is still struck by the fact that we have no standard on which to rely as far as talking about professional growth of educational practices for a group that is in high leverage standards on one hand, and yet, is trying to attach itself to the results based approach you all are using for the framework. If the work of this committee is all about professional growth and development, I would say to you that it is a slow process. The best thing I learned today was Pennsylvania took two and a half years. I would say that we have a lot of work to do.

He continued, in the meantime, what we cannot come back to with better clarity is with respect to the weighting. As far as what is interjected today is a bit of new information, there seems to be on your committee a preconceived notion about reliability. My visual from today is Page 17, which is great. I will come back to the fact that there is a perception in readdressing weighting in terms of making sure it is reliable and reflects the rest of the design. So, we are right back to how it is that we look at the instructional outcomes for people who are not teaching. The big dilemma in the room today is how we resolve the issue in respect to Page 17. The consensus that group will bring you is that we can't do that with a 25/25 weighting in terms of the nature of the practices of the OLEP. In closing, I would ask for some representation from TLC at our next stakeholder's meeting. I regret today that it didn't look like consensus with respect to the weighting. The message to me is quite clear we are not operating in the range of 25/25. Thank you so much for today. I really appreciate the department.

14. Meeting Adjournment Dr. Pam Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Meeting adjourned 4:22 pm.